REMARKS

Claims 1-52 are pending in this application, with claims 1 and 27 being independent. Independent claims 1 and 27 have been amended along with claims 18, 21, 44 and 47. No new matter has been added by way of these amendments. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments of the Applicant, which are preceded by related comments of the Examiner in small bold type:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 8-11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21, 26, 27-29, 31, 34-37, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yurkovic (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,585) in view of Dailey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,352), hereinafter, Dailey.

Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to further clarify that the media event produced by the server device and transferred to the client device. In particular, Applicant's amended independent claim 1 recites a "program code configured to cause a browser at the client device to be automatically launched for presentation of the media event based on the information relating to the media event, wherein the media event includes a data stream broadcast produced by the server device, the data stream broadcast includes at least one of data encoded during production of the data stream broadcast and data previously encoded." Support for this subject matter may be found, for example, on page 7, lines 13-25 of the originally filed application, which reads:

> If the host device 26 is a computer, data signal 58 may be encoded 256 prior to being transmitted to server 38. Typical encoding schemes include MPEG (i.e., Moving Picture Experts Group) encoding, AVI (i.e., Audio Video Interleaved) encoding, and RM (i.e., Real Networks ^{TM}) encoding, for example.
>
> Once data signal 58 is received by server 38, data stream 60 is generated and broadcast 258 to the attendees. In the event that data signal 58 is already encoded (i.e., data signal 58 was sent by a host device that is a computer), data

> signal 58 is broadcast as a data stream 60 across network 24. Alternatively, if
> data signal 58 is not encoded or is encoded in a non-standard format, data signal
> 58 will be encoded 260 into a standard format (e.g., MPEG, AVI, and RM) prior
> to be broadcast as data stream 60. Depending on the type of media event, data
> stream 60 may be an audio stream, a video stream, or an audio/video stream.
> Data stream 60 may also carry a data channel that instructs a presentation to
> advance slides and display polls.

In contrast, the teachings of Yurkovic and Dailey, individually or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the limitations of amended independent claim 1. In particular, Yurkovic is understood to describe a network-based presentation session being initiated by a user by manually selecting a "enter a session" command on either a moderator command section or on an administration console screen (Yurkovic, col. 6, lines 26-30). Dailey is understood to describe a system for scheduling virtual meeting between a host and one or more meeting participants. At the scheduled time and date, a virtual meeting utility is invoked both for the host and the participant (Daily, col. 3, lines 8-33).

No combination of Yurkovic and Dailey discloses or suggests program code configured to cause a browser at a client device to be automatically launched for presentation of a media event based on information relating to the media event, wherein the media event includes a data stream broadcast produced by a server device, the data stream broadcast includes at least one of data encoded during production of the data stream broadcast and data previously encoded, as required by amended independent claim 1. For at least the above reasons, amended independent claim 1 is believed to be patentable. Furthermore, independent claim 27 has been amended to include limitations that are similar to of amended independent claim 1. As such independent claim 27 is also believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons described above.

As dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 8-11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21 and 26 depend upon independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 2, 3, 5, 8-11, 13, 14, 17, 18, 20, 21 and 26 are also patentable over the combination of cited references. Further, as dependent claims 28, 29, 31, 34-37, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46 and 47 depend upon independent claim 27, Applicant respectfully asserts that claims 28, 29, 31, 34-37, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46 and 47 are also patentable over the combination of cited references.

Claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13-14, 17-22, 27-29, 31, 34, 35, 37, and 39-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being anticipated by Bookspan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,888) in view of Dailey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,352), hereinafter, Dailey.

Bookspan is not understood to remedy the forgoing deficiencies of Daily. For example, Bookspan is not understood to disclose or suggest program code configured to cause a browser at a client device to be automatically launched for presentation of a media event based on information relating to the media event, wherein the media event includes a data stream broadcast produced by a server device, the data stream broadcast includes at least one of data encoded during production of the data stream broadcast and data previously encoded, as required by amended independent claim 1. Rather, Bookspan appears to describe embedding script commands in a stream that trigger commands at a viewer's machine. Specifically, Bookspan reads:

> The communication is accomplished through a combination of two
> technologies: embedding script commands in an ASF stream, and
> animations in the POWERPOINT HTML files (i.e., the presentation slides).
> POWERPOINT is thus able to send events via an audio/video stream to the
> viewer, which triggers commands on the viewer's machine and in turn
> effects actions on the web page displayed on the viewer's machine.
> (Bookspan, col. 24 lines 2-9).

> Media Player, receives and decodes the ASF stream, as shown by a block
> 1506. The WINDOWS ™ Media Player then executes an event when it
> receives a script command in a block 1508. (Bookspan, col. 24 lines 26-29).

Thus, Bookspan is understood to describe an encoding scheme that calls for a user to manually input script commands for driving animations in a presentation broadcast from a remote location. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that no combination of Dailey and Bookspan renders obvious the features of claims 1-3, 5, 8, 9, 11, 13-14, 17-22, 27-29, 31, 34, 35, 37 and 39-48.

Claims 4, 7, 30 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yurkovic (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,585) in view of Dailey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,352), hereinafter, Dailey.

Claims 4 and 7 depend from amended independent claim 1 and claims 30 and 33 depend from amended independent claim 27. As mentioned above, neither Yurkovic nor Dailey, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest program code configured to cause a browser at a client device to be automatically launched for presentation of a media event based on information relating to the media event, wherein the media event includes a data stream broadcast produced by a server device, the data stream broadcast includes at least one of data encoded during production of the data stream broadcast and data previously encoded. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that no combination of Yurkovic and Dailey renders obvious the features of claims 4, 7, 30 and 33.

Claim 6 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yurkovic (U.S. Patent No. 6,487,585) in view of Dailey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,352), hereinafter, Dailey, and further in view of Dunlap et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,560,637, hereinafter, Dunlap).

Dunlap is not understood to remedy the forgoing deficiencies of Yurkovic and Dailey. For example, Dunlap is not understood to disclose or suggest program code configured to cause a browser at a client device to be automatically launched for presentation of a media event based on information relating to the media event, wherein the media event includes a data stream broadcast produced by a server device, the data stream broadcast includes at least one of data encoded during production of the data stream broadcast and data previously encoded, as required by amended independent claims 1 and 27. Rather, Dunlap appears to describe a presentation device that includes an embedded web server for transmitting slide presentation information (to network connected terminals) while simultaneously displaying the presentation. Accordingly,

Applicant respectfully asserts that no combination of Yurkovic, Dailey and Dunlap render obvious the features of claims 6 and 32.

Claims 23-25 and 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bookspan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,888) in view of Dailey et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,363,352), hereinafter, Dailey, and further in view of Hanson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,457,045, hereinafter, Hanson).

Hanson is not understood to remedy the forgoing deficiencies of Bookspan and Dailey. For example, Hanson is not understood to describe or suggest program code configured to cause a browser at a client device to be automatically launched for presentation of a media event based on information relating to the media event, wherein the media event includes a data stream broadcast produced by a server device, the data stream broadcast includes at least one of data encoded during production of the data stream broadcast and data previously encoded, as required by amended independent claims 1 and 27. Rather, Hanson is understood to describe a system for assisting a group of participants, connected to a network, in making choices in regards to schedules, invitations, polls, or other similar situations. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that no combination of Bookspan, Dailey and Hanson render obvious the features of claims 23-25 and 49-51.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

In view of the foregoing remarks, the entire application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' attorney can be reached at the address shown below. Telephone calls regarding this application should be directed to 617-368-2191.

No fee are believed due at this time. Please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 14618-007001.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 31, 2008

Paul Pysher
Reg. No. 40,780

PTO Customer No. 26161
Fish & Richardson P.C.
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906

21815468.doc